UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/820,004	04/08/2004	Ballie Michel	0510-1093	8562
466 YOUNG & TH	7590 10/30/200 OMPSON	EXAMINER		
209 Madison St		BRUNSMAN, DAVID M		
Suite 500 ALEXANDRIA	A, VA 22314	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/820,004	MICHEL, BALLIE	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	David M. Brunsman	1793	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>16 October 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 cension and the corresponding amount of the chortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed was AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	cause
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor			oause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	,	,,	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	acted claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	sorresponding number of finally reje	scied ciaims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		(1	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered bur See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). ((PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/David M Brunsman/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1793	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With respect to the Examiner's treatment of the declaration, the instant invention is to be compared to the closest prior art. The examiner has identified Example IV of the reference as the closest prior art. While reasonable deviations therefrom may be entertained they must be justified. Just because a modification may fall within the broad scope of the patent, it does not maintain status as the closest prior art. Applicant's reasoning for substituted toluene alone for the benzene/toluene mixture of the prior art is accepted. There is no evidence that the action of cobalt carboxylate would be expected to be indistinguishable from that of cobalt linoleate (the preferred drier). While cobalt linoleate may be the recognized substitute for linoleate, there is no evidence that the art would consider them to be indistinguishable equivalents. There is no basis in the declaration for the correction that the drier is added in a 15% solution or that one of ordinary skill in the art would expect to use similar weights rather than mole proportions of driers. While it may be transcription error, there is no evidence of record that the temperature to which H1 is preheated is actually 200 C. There is no evidence of record that R1 is preheated to 200 C. The prior art relied upon requires that the mixture be stirred with heating at 230-250 C "till a thread of 6 to 8 inches is obtained" there is no hard time limit on that process. A single attempt using one narrow embodiment is insufficient to overcome the assumption that the patent example is fully enabled. With respect to the scope and meaning of the term "binder" the examiner's position is clearly set forth in the final rejection. The material of the instant claims is to be compared with the closest prior art, the dried binder of the reference.